

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/902,576	07/12/2001	Masaru Kogure	32405W084	3624
7590 04/20/2005			EXAMINER	
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP			CATHEY II, PATRICK H	
Beveridge, DeGrandi, Weilacher & Young				
Intellectual Property Group			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1850 M Street, N.W. (Suite 800)			2613	
Washington D	C 20036			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summers	09/902,576	KOGURE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Patrick H. Cathey II	2613			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	J. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirty bd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ² ute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>, </u>				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	nis action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) 3-12 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	<u>.</u>			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the l					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apiority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on October 26, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Saneyoshi et al. (US 5,410,346) reference for Claim's 1 and 2. The amendment was ineffective because the amendment only added information to the preamble which is not considered further limiting the claims.

The amendment filed on October 26, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Saneyoshi et al. (US 5,410,346) reference for Claim's 3-12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saneyoshi et al. (US 5,410,346).

Saneyoshi et al. teaches a vehicle front-view monitoring system for taking fail-safe measures preventing at least one of a vehicle control and a warning control executing on the basis of the vehicle front-view monitoring system from malfunctioning due to lowering a monitoring accuracy (Column 7, lines 20-39), the system comprising: that the optical system (10) for taking images is in the front view of the vehicle (Column 2, lines 46-47; see also figures 1 and 2). He also teaches a calculating method for the

Art Unit: 2613

brightness data of the image (Column 9, lines 53-63). He then shows that if there is a fail occurring then a fail-safe measure, or a warning, would take place (Column 7, lines 33-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Thè following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saneyoshi et al. (US 5,410,346) in view of Yasui (US 6,091,833).

Saneyoshi et al. fails to teach that the data indicates a horizontal distribution on the image, but Yasui et al. does (Column 10, lines 55-65). Since Yasui's et al. system will allow for guide detection of lanes, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to have the data indicate a horizontal distribution on the image.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim's 3-12 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As for Claim's 3-9, many limitations are listed in the above rejection of Claim 1. However, Saneyoshi et al. fail to specifically teach where the determination section

determines the fail based on a parameter obtained by the calculator and normalizes the luminance-distribution characteristic values by a shutter speed for the camera device.

As for Claim's 10-12, many limitations are listed in the above rejection of Claim 1. However, Saneyoshi et al. fail to specifically teach where the calculator calculates a luminance center as the luminance data, the luminance center corresponding to a horizontal position on the image at which luminance are converged and the determination section determines the fail by evaluating the horizontal luminance distribution on the image based on the luminance center.

A further search was conducted which failed to yield any prior art. Therefore, the prior art fails to teach or render obvious these limitations taken within the others in the claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2613

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick H. Cathey II whose telephone number is (571)272-7326. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 to 5:00 (Every other friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571)272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick H. Cathey II Examiner Art Unit 2613

PHC

CHRIS RELEASE

TECHNOLOGY CENT